

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,060	03/30/2004	Johannes Mauser	02418.0885	1295
22852	7590 09/09/2005		EXAM	INER
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			CHIU, RALEIGH W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/812,060	MAUSER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Raleigh Chiu	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers  9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access	vn from consideration.  relection requirement.  r.  epted or b) □ objected to by the E					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of the correction of the cor	· · · · · ·	• •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		` ,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/30/2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					

Art Unit: 3711

### DETAILED ACTION

### Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35
 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 5-7 and 9, the phrase "preferably" or "preferable" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,060

Art Unit: 3711

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §§ 102 and 103

Page 3

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,573,242 (Yoo).

Regarding claim 1, Figure 3 of Yoo shows at least four depressions 22 arranged about the frame profile.

Regarding claims 2-4, as the Yoo depressions are formed around the entire frame periphery, their locations are considered to meet the recited clock positions.

7. Claims 5-7, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo as applied above.

Art Unit: 3711

Regarding claims 5-7, discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable has been held to be within the capabilities of the person of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in this art, by routine experimentation, to provide the Yoo depressions with the recited sizes in order to obtain the optimum combination of power and flexibility for the racquet frame.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, it is old and well-known in the tennis racquet art to provide strengthening layers along the weaker portions of the racquet frame; the use of windings at forty-five degrees with common materials such as carbon FRP is also considered to be old and well-known in the art.

### Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of copending Application No. 10/812,067. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same combination of depressions and openings are claimed.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### Conclusion

- 10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raleigh Chiu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4408. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich, can be reached on (571) 272-4415.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Application/Control Number: 10/812,060

Page 6

Art Unit: 3711

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raleigh W. Chiu Primary Examiner

Technology Center 3700

RWC:dei:feif

1 September 2005